

### **Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 4 and 9 are amended. Claim 15 is new. Claims 4-9, 13, and 15 are pending in the application. Support for the amendment to claims 4 and 9 can be found at p. 22, lines 1-6 and Fig. 3 of the specification. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103**

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chisako (J.P. Patent Pub. No. 10-332988) in view of Uenoyama, et al. (JP. Pub. 203-139994). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4, has been amended as follows:

An optical receptacle comprising:

a fiber stub;

a holder directly fixing the fiber stub; and

a sleeve into which the fiber stub is inserted, having a thicker portion directly holding the fiber stub;

wherein the thicker portion has an outer surface of a periphery of the thicker portion not contacting the holder.

Claim 4 has been amended to clarify that the "outer surface" corresponds to the periphery of the thicker portion of the sleeve (see Applicants specification at page 22, lines 1-6 and figure 3). Applicant respectfully submits that Chisako fails to disclose or teach the following features as required by claim 4: (A) a sleeve that has a thicker portion and (B) a sleeve where the outer surface of the periphery does not contact the holder. For example, Applicants specification at figure 3 illustrates that the outer surface of the periphery of the thicker portion of the sleeve (4a) does not contact the holder (5). In other words, figure 3 shows that there is a space between (4a) and (5).

Chisako fails to disclose or teach a sleeve (15) that has a thicker portion and also fails to disclose or teach a sleeve where the outer surface or periphery does not contact a hold ring (13), as required by claim 4. In contrast, Chisako discloses an optical receptacle comprising a sleeve (15), a sleeve case (11), and a hold ring (13). The hold ring (13) is in contact with and holds the sleeve (15) in a sleeve case (11) (abstract and figure 1). Thus, there is no space between the hold ring (13) and the sleeve (15). Accordingly, Chisako does not teach or suggest the optical receptacle of claim 4.

Uenoyama is not seen to remedy the defects of Chisako and the Office does not rely upon the reference for such. Instead, Uenoyama is cited for its relevance regarding a fiber stub (5) that is directly fixed to a holder (3) (abstract and figure 4). As such, the combined teachings of the prior art fail to teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention. As such, the combination suggested by the Office cannot render the claimed invention obvious.

The Examiner indicates that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Chisako and Uenoyama to fix the rear end of the fiber stub (5) directly to the holder because the arrangement would be a "free of difficulty assembly." Applicant respectfully submits that if the rear end of Uenoyamas' fiber stub (5) was fixed directly to the hold ring (3) disclosed by Chisako, the receptacle would still fail to disclose a sleeve that has a thicker portion and a sleeve where the outer surface of the periphery does not contact the holder, as required by claim 4.

Accordingly, Chisako in view of Uenoyama is not obvious over the present claim 4. Likewise, dependent claims 5-7 are also patentable over Chisako in view of Uenoyama for at least the same reasons as claim 4. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chisako in view of Kato (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0076384). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 depends from amended claim 4, and as such includes all the limitations thereof, and is therefore patentable over Chisako for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 4. Kato is not seen to remedy the defects of Chisako and the Office does not rely upon the references for such. Instead, Kato is cited for its relevance regarding chamfering in an optical module.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that, Chisako and Kato could not have anticipated or rendered obvious claim 8, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0076384) in view of Rucks, et al. (U.S. Pat. No 6,186,671). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 9, has been amended as follows:

An optical receptacle comprising:

- a ceramic precision sleeve for holding a plug ferrule, having an outer surface of its periphery;

- a metal holder is provided at a rear end of the outer surface of the precision sleeve, and;

- a metal flange provided on the outer surface of the precision sleeve separately from the metal holder.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kato fails to disclose or teach the following features of claim 9: (A) a metal holder that is provided on the outer surface of the periphery of the precision sleeve and (B) a metal flange that is

provided separately from the metal holder on the same outer surface of the precision sleeve. Thus a metal holder and a metal flange is electrically insulated. Instead Kato discloses an optical module including a precision sleeve (107) with a holder (34). Thus, there is no metal flange or a metal flange that is separated by electrical insulation from a metal holder, as required by claim 9. Accordingly, Kato does not teach or suggest the optical receptacle of claim 9.

Rucks is not seen to remedy the defects of Kato and the Office does not rely upon the reference for such. Instead, Rucks is cited for its relevance regarding a ferrule, which may be inserted inside of a optical receptacle (abstract). Rucks does not disclose an optical receptacle, as required by claim 9. As such, the combined teachings of the prior art fail to teach or suggest each element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the combination suggested by the Office cannot render the claimed invention obvious.

Accordingly, Kato in view of Rucks is not obvious over the present claim 9. Likewise, dependent claim 13 is also patentable over Kato in view of Rucks. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/560,569  
Amdt. Dated July 2, 2008  
Reply to Final Office Action of April 2, 2008

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134  
Customer No. 26021

## Conclusion


In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4617 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: July 2, 2008

By:   
Natalie A. Davis, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 53,849  
For Hogan & Hartson, LLP

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Phone: 310-785-4600  
Fax: 310-785-4601